



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ces petites observations ne nous font pas perdre de vue la très réelle valeur de l'ouvrage de M. St. Langdon. Elles prouvent l'intérêt que nous avons mis à parcourir et à contrôler ses interprétations. Ces textes, si intéressants au point de vue de la mythologie et du sentiment religieux des Babyloniens, sont ici groupés et, le plus souvent, traduits pour la première fois. Le travail de l'auteur est un travail de pionnier, ce qui en explique les imperfections de détail que nous avons relevées çà et là. Si nous osions formuler un souhait, ce serait que M. St. Langdon reprît l'étude de ces textes au point de vue grammatical et lexicographique, et qu'il livrât au public le résultat de cette recherche. Ce sera compléter la besogne si utile, qu'il a entreprise depuis quelques années, de faciliter l'intelligence des textes sumériens. Ses suppléments aux listes de Meissner et ses diverses études dans les *Babyloniaca* sont déjà d'excellents augures.

P. DHORME

JÉRUSALEM
11 Novembre 1909

AL-KINDI'S HISTORY OF THE QĀDĪS OF EGYPT¹

This work, which Professor Gottheil has edited from the only manuscript now known to contain it, is one of very considerable interest and importance. The period which it covers begins with the first establishment of the office of qādī in Egypt in the year 31 A. H. (651 A. D.), at the beginning of the Mohammedan occupation, and extends to the year 424 (1033). This was the formative period of Muslim jurisprudence, and Egypt was a country in which many interesting things were happening.

In the case of each qādī the dates of his accession and removal, or death, are given, including usually the day of the month. The biographical sketches contain, as a rule, only matters connected with the office of the judge, not miscellaneous reminiscences. The authority by which he received his appointment is recorded, and if he was removed for cause, the circumstances are described. The official qualities of each incumbent of the office are set forth in more or less detail, usually in the form of a series of incidents from which the reader is left to draw his own conclusions. It is in the intrinsic importance of these recorded incidents that the chief value of the work lies. The material collected by al-Kindi, in particular, which forms the principal part of the compilation, contains much information, accessible nowhere else, which is of the first importance for our knowledge of the inner history of Egypt in the first centuries of the Mohammedan dominion. Illuminating hints as to political

¹ THE HISTORY OF THE EGYPTIAN CADIS AS COMPILED BY ABŪ OMAR MUHAMMAD IBN YUSUF IBN YA'QŪB AL-KINDI, TOGETHER WITH ADDITIONS BY ABŪ AL-ḤASAN AḤMAD IBN 'ABD AL-RAḤMĀN IBN BURD. Edited from the unique MS in the British Museum by Richard J. H. Gottheil. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1908.

and social conditions are given, official documents are sometimes quoted *in extenso*, and especially, of course, we are given much detailed information as to the evolution of the office of qāḍī and the actual administration of justice. Many of the narratives are entertaining as well as instructive, and this is true also of not a few of the many bits of poetry which are scattered through the book. The popular or partisan estimate of the official occasionally crystallized in a few verses, laudatory, denunciatory, or satirical, which were thereupon handed about, and served much the same purpose as the cartoons in our illustrated periodicals. Some of these verses are decidedly amusing, besides being written with some literary skill. Such, for instance, are the several productions (pp. 82 ff., 95 f.) written in ridicule of certain Copts who succeeded in getting themselves pronounced pure-blooded Arabs by a bribed judge and suborned witnesses; or the verses which describe, with elaborate sarcasm, the changed circumstances of the magistrate who, together with all his near relatives and cronies, rose from poverty to magnificence by misappropriating the funds intrusted to him (p. 80); or the somewhat excited lines (p. 135) called forth by the controversy over the tall hats which Ibn Abi 'l-Laith had prohibited. The qāḍī al-'Umārī is vehemently denounced, in several scraps of poetry, for his wine-drinking and his unholy love of music (p. 83); some of his fellows are even more sharply called to account for their alleged dishonesty. It is not surprising that the offending poet—when he could be discovered—was sometimes roughly handled.

In the Introduction (pp. iii-xvii), Gottheil treats at some length the history and significance of the office of qāḍī. This is a subject to which he had previously paid some attention; see especially his article, "A Distinguished Family of Fatimide Cadis," in the *Journal of the Am. Oriental Soc.*, Vol. XXVII (1906), pp. 217-96. A still more thoroughgoing treatment of the matter, using all the available material, would be very welcome; at present, some important points remain obscure. It is a pity that the text of al-Kindī could not have been accompanied at once by a translation; this, however, we may perhaps hope to receive later.

The history of the Egyptian qāḍīs has been written, expanded, or revised by several hands, as has long been known, and the publication of this text brings to light some interesting problems. According to all the later Mohammedan writers, al-Kindī first wrote the history of the qāḍīs, carrying it down to the year 246, from which point his work was continued by Ibn Zūlāq, who belonged to the next following generation. This expanded history was thenceforward the standard work in its field, and is the one which Ibn Ḥajar († 852) took as his chief early authority in compiling his own biographical dictionary of the magistrates of Egypt, entitled رَفْعُ الْأَصْرِ فِي قَضَاءِ مِصْرَ. No other continuation of al-Kindī's monograph than that by Ibn Zūlāq has been known. But in this

solitary manuscript, preserved in the British Museum, there is a surprise for us. The portion of the history purporting to have been written by al-Kindi does indeed extend to the year 246. At that point, after the introductory announcement regarding the qāḍī Bakkār, there is a note in the MS (fol. 215a) which reads: **آخر ما عمله ابو عمر من اخبار** **قضاة مصر**, "Here ends what Abū 'Umar [al-Kindi] composed of the history of the qāḍīs of Egypt." But the continuation, carrying on the history of Bakkār's term of office, and following it with the account of his successors down to the year 366, when 'Alī ibn an-Nu'mān was given the formal appointment, is not the work of Ibn Zūlāq, but that of an otherwise quite unknown writer, whose name is given (*ibid.*) as Abu 'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Burd. This *dhail* of Ibn Burd was obviously composed for the purpose of supplementing al-Kindi, whose spoken (not written) word is once expressly quoted, on p. 159, l. 4 (fol. 220b). Its author cites as his chief authority, for the years 246-314, Muḥammad ibn ar-Rabi' ibn Sulaimān al-Jizī,² and brings the history down to his own day (as his pupil says, p. 149, l. 5: **الى عصرنا هذا**).

For the history after the year 314 he names no authorities at all; saving that on one occasion, as already mentioned, he says of a certain piece of information that he had received it verbally from al-Kindi. He must have died soon after the year 367, the latest date which his *dhail* contains.

But this is not all. There is also a *second* appendix, this time anonymous, composed in continuation of Ibn Burd. It is introduced (fol. 222b) by the words: **بقية التالى لكتاب ابى عمر محمد بن يوسف الكندى فى اخبار قضاة مصر**. Its first item is a correction of Ibn Burd's statement regarding the accession of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Naṣr, the next to the last of the qāḍīs named by him. He had given the date (p. 161, l. 9) as the second *raḥī'* of the year 348; his continuator, on the contrary, asserts that it was the first *raḥī'* of the year 347. That this was expressly intended as a correction of Ibn Burd, and written for this place, seems plain from the fact that the writer says not a word more about this qāḍī, but goes on at once with 'Alī ibn an-Nu'mān, with whose appointment to office Ibn Burd had ended his work.³ The

² This same Muḥammad ibn ar-Rabi' is also cited once or twice by al-Kindi. I have not been able to ascertain the date of his death. Ibn Sa'id (ed. Tallquist, p. 101) mentions him in connection with events of the year 306. His father, ar-Rabi', who was a man of some note, died in the year 256 (Khall., tr. Slane, I, 520; Yāqūt, II, 177; *Husn.*, I, 186). He must not be confused with his contemporary, ar-Rabi' ibn Sulaimān (who also had a son named Muḥammad), who is often mentioned as a disciple of aš-Šāfi'.

³ Gottheil edits here with a row of dots between the date and the following name, but in his notes on the text nothing is said of any blank space at this point. The dots, therefore, presumably express his opinion that something is missing which originally stood here; but if the view advanced above is correct, the text stands just as it was originally written.

date of 'Alī's accession, also, is corrected. According to Ibn Burd, the removal of Muḥammad from office and the reading of 'Alī's diploma in the mosque had taken place on the same day; but from the continuator's statement it appears that there was an interval of just one week. The new *dhail* is then carried on as far as the year 424, that is, presumably, to about the time when it was composed (notice the way in which the words **اتصل بنا** are used on p. 165, l. 9, and p. 166, l. 14). It is very meager until the last qādis are reached, and even then what we have is merely two or three incidents long drawn out, rather than any really extensive information. The writer names no authorities, and presumably did not expect himself to be cited as an authority by subsequent writers. He merely wished to bring al-Kindī down to date for practical purposes, and made his task as light as possible, putting down only the necessary names and dates, and in the latter part the few additional items which he happened to recollect.

The story of al-Kindī's history of the qādis, then, so far as we are able to trace it, seems to have been as follows:

1. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam († 257) included in his *Conquest of Egypt* a concise account of the qādis. He belonged to a family which was much interested in jurisprudence, and his father, 'Abdallah ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, had been associated with the qādi as censor of witnesses (he was not himself qādi, as Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, I, 148, and others have said). He was above all things a student of the Tradition, interested in the *isnād* as well as in the fact behind it, and his chief concern was with the earlier period of Egyptian history. Hence it was that his biographies of the magistrates, which were at first tolerably extended, dwindle as they approach his own day until they become at last little more than a succession of names and dates.

2. Al-Kindī († 350) was one of those who handed down the **فتوح مصر** of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam. From the author himself the text was passed on to his pupil, Alī ibn Qudaid. From the latter it was then received and transmitted by two scholars. One of these was Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Faraj al-Qammāh, from whom we have the "standard" text found in three of the four known manuscripts and attested elsewhere (e. g., in Abu 'l-Maḥāsin, I, 6); the other was al-Kindī, whose recension is preserved in MS 1686 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The name is incorrectly written at the beginning of the manuscript (fol. 1b, **ابو عمر بن محمد بن يوسف الكرماني**), which must be emended to **ابو عمر محمد بن يوسف الكندي**, whence it happened that Slane, in his *Catalogue*, and other scholars failed to recognize the interesting fact. At the beginning of other chapters—for example, the one treating of the qādis—the name is given correctly.

3. Al-Kindī revised and greatly expanded Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's chapter on the qāḍīs, making out of it a new and highly important monograph. His chief interest was in the history, not in the science of tradition, and his work was most voluminous just where that of his predecessor had been most scanty. The period of history which was covered by the compilation included those things which were most momentous in the development of early Muslim jurisprudence: the Mu'tazilite controversy and the *miḥna*, or religious inquisition, under al-Ma'mūn; the reactionary reign of al-Mutawakkil; and the establishment of the four great schools of law. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam had ended his chapter with the year 246, and al-Kindī closed his own *History of the Qāḍīs* at the same point. This has recently been doubted by Mr. H. F. Amedroz, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (October, 1909, pp. 1145 f.), but on quite insufficient grounds. Ibn Ḥallikān (tr. Slane, I, 388) says that al-Kindī's annals of the qāḍīs extended to the year 246; and adds, that Ibn Zūlāq's continuation of this work began with the biography of Bakkār ibn Qutaiba. This corresponds exactly with what we have before us in the London manuscript. Both Ibn Zūlāq and Ibn Burd were personally acquainted with al-Kindī, and in all likelihood both were pupils of his.⁴ Each one of the two, in writing a continuation of his monograph, began with the year 246.⁵ It is really additional testimony to the same effect when Ḥāji Ḥalifa (ed. Flügel, No. 2,312) says that al-Kindī *died* in the year 246; someone's statement in regard to the end of his *History of the Qāḍīs* had been misunderstood. Amedroz lays weight on the fact that a certain anecdote of the qāḍī Bakkār is told by Ibn Ḥajar on the authority of "al-Kindī," though it is not found in the present work. But this is easily explained. The anecdote in question comes from Ibn Zūlāq (see Ibn Ḥallikān, IV, pp. 592 f., in the biography of Yūnus ibn 'Abd al-A'lā), and moreover, not from his account of the qāḍīs, but from his *Ta'riḥ Miṣr*. The ascription to al-Kindī is probably merely an instance of the very frequent confusion of master with pupil; and, in any case, there is nothing to suggest that the anecdote ever stood in al-Kindī's work *on the qāḍīs*. Amedroz says further (*ibid.*, p. 1146) what implies that evidence exists tending to show that Ibn Zūlāq's work on the qāḍīs may have begun with the year 335. But where is the evidence to be found? The note on the margin of fol. 131a, in this manuscript, referred to by Amedroz, has to do only with al-Kindī's account of the *governors*, which was cut short by his death just as he had brought it down to the year 335. It is certainly not permissible to give the statement any connection with his account of the *qāḍīs*. He may of course

⁴This was certainly true of Ibn Zūlāq; see Gottheil's article in the *Journal of the Am. Or. Society*, XXVIII (1907), p. 255, l. 14; p. 263, l. 9. In the case of Ibn Burd it is at least probable; see what was said above in regard to him.

⁵Ibn Ḥajar, in his *Raf' al-Iṣr*, quotes expressly from Ibn Zūlāq in the biography of Bakkār ibn Qutaiba; Gottheil, *ibid.*, pp. 255 f.

have hoped to take up again, at some later day, the last-named work, and continue it from the year 246 down to his own time, or he may have suggested such a continuation to his pupils; as to that we have no information. But this much seems certain, that every particle of evidence, external and internal, goes to show that Ibn Zūlāq's *اخبار قضاة مصر*, that is, the part which he himself compiled, began with the life of Bakkār ibn Qutaiba.

4. Ibn Burd wrote a *dhail* to al-Kindī's history of the qādis, carrying it down to the year 367, which was probably near to the date of his death (see above). It was an inadequate continuation, and was eventually superseded by the more elaborate work of his younger contemporary, Ibn Zūlāq. The original monograph of al-Kindī continued to be handed down without either continuation. This was probably the case in the recension which here lies before us. Ibn an-Naḥḥās († 416; more than ninety years old at the time of his death; *Husn* I, 175), who transmits the text, received it from its author; and if he had included Ibn Burd in his recension, we should pretty certainly have some indication of the fact on fol. 215a.

5. An unknown writer, who flourished in the early part of the fifth century, wrote a continuation of Ibn Burd's *dhail*, correcting one or two of its statements and bringing the annals of the qādis down to 424 A. H. He may or may not have known Ibn Zūlāq's work; if he did, he presumably found it much too extensive for his own purpose. This doubly expanded edition of al-Kindī was probably very little used. Our unique manuscript is a copy made in Damascus in the year 624.

6. Ibn Zūlāq († 387), whose works seem to have been to a considerable extent an expanded repetition of those of his teacher al-Kindī, handed down the latter's *قضاة مصر* and supplemented it with a *dhail* that was really adequate. He doubtless knew, and possibly used, the work of Ibn Burd. If we had for this period a considerable number of such citations as the one from ad-Dahabī noticed by Amedroz (*loc. cit.*, p. 1145), we might be able to reach a sure conclusion on this point. The appendix began at the year 246, and was carried as far as 386, the year before the one in which the author died; so we are told by Ibn Ḥallikān (*loc. cit.*), and Ibn Ḥajar's *Raf' al-Iṣr* in the biography of Muḥammad ibn an-Nu'mān quotes Ibn Zūlāq by name (Gottheil, *JAOS.*, XXVIII, p. 256).⁶ The later historians and biographers, such as Ibn Ḥajar, seem to have used al-Kindī chiefly, or only, in the edition of Ibn Zūlāq.

⁶ In the Introduction to the present volume, p. xviii, and also in the *JAOS.*, XXVII, p. 224, Gottheil speaks of 386 (996 A. D.) as the year of the death of the qādi Muḥammad. That is not the case, however; it was the year of the death of the caliph al-'Aziz, and three years before that of Muḥammad, which occurred in 389.

Besides the Introduction and the Arabic text, Gottheil has given us a full and very helpful Index of Proper Names, and about twenty pages of Notes. These last deal almost exclusively with the text, and contain a great many parallel readings from Ibn Ḥajar. Unfortunately, they are not put at the foot of the page, but occupy a distant part of the book. This arrangement is sometimes necessary in a voluminous commentary, though even there it is usually undesirable, but for such notes as these it ought never to be employed. In the present case, the inconvenience is made all the greater by the character of the text and the way in which it is treated. Editing a unique Arabic manuscript is a very difficult matter at best, and this London codex, though well written and on the whole trustworthy, needs to be corrected in a good many places. In the work of emendation Gottheil is both conservative and judicious, but he seems to have printed the text before fully making up his mind how to edit it. What he gives us, in the body of the book, is neither a diplomatic reproduction of the codex nor the result of his own study, but something half-way between. The reader is therefore kept constantly turning to the notes and back again. Doubtless some necessity of haste, and the difficulties resulting from printing the text abroad (in Rome), are chiefly accountable for this defect in the edition.

For the criticism of the text Gottheil was able to use four Paris manuscripts. Two of these contain the *رفع الإصر*, in compiling which Ibn Ḥajar made extensive use of Ibn Zūlāq's edition of al-Kindī; the third is an abridgment of Ibn Ḥajar by his grandson, Ibn Šāhin. Though these are often very helpful, the type of text which they exhibit is generally less primitive than that of Ibn an-Naḥḥās. The fourth MS is one containing Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's annals of the qāḍis, Part VI of his *فتوح مصر*. This is the MS which was mentioned above as containing *al-Kindī's recension* of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam. It is interesting to observe that the text of this recension exhibits a number of peculiarities which are also found in the London text of al-Kindī. Thus, the very well-known name *سليم بن عتر* is invariably written *سليم بن عنز*; the even more familiar *ابن لهيعة* is pointed *لُهَيْعَة*; and in the *isnāds* each *حدثنا فلان* is followed by *قال*, while in the more common usage, followed by all the MSS of the other recension of the *فتوح مصر*, as well as by the Ibn Burd appendix (149, 5) in the Kindī MS, the *قال* is used only after the last name in the series.⁷

⁷ The fact must not be overlooked that there are *two* copies of the *Futūḥ Miṣr* in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Gottheil, p. xviii, speaks of "the" Paris MS; and Amedroz, p. 1143, speaks of "the finely written MS of Paris," which description shows that he has in

The text as printed in this edition, after receiving all the emendation suggested by Gottheil in his notes, still needs to be corrected in a great many places. Some of these have been pointed out by Amedroz, *loc. cit.*; still other instances are the following. I have not included the typographical errors, which are also numerous.

3, 1. The last name in the marginal gloss (see note) was certainly *ابو عمر*, not *ابو بكر*. Cf. what was said, above, as to the age of Ibn an-Nahhās.—L. 10. For *عن الليث* read *عن الليث*, and put a period after *ابيه*.—4, 6. Judging from the great multitude of similar cases, the word *قال* has fallen out after *يوسف*.—L. 13. The history has been sadly confused here by an accident. In one of the MSS from which this one was descended a single leaf was transposed. To restore the original order, the section which begins with the last word (*حدثنا*) of l. 2, p. 6, and ends with the last word of l. 11, p. 7, must be inserted between ll. 13 and 14 on p. 4. There must be no paragraph division at the beginning of the section; at the end of it the break occurred in the middle of a sentence.—L. 16. Cancel the last five words.—5, 12. For *يَقْضَى* read *يُقْضَى*.—L. 16. For *قَاضِي* read *قَاصَّ*.—6, 16. Gottheil inserts *وكان* by conjecture, and does not understand the two preceding words. Should not the MS be read and pointed as follows: *فبالغرب كثير من البربر*?—L. 18. Read *اميرى*.—9, 1. The very carefully and correctly written London MS of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam always writes this name *عَلَى*.—L. 2. MS *فائره*. Probably IV stem, and pronounced in the popular way, *فَاقِرَه* (for *فَاقِرْتَه*, which form actually stands here in the London MS of Ḥakam).—L. 17. For *صاحب الخراج* read *صاحبه*.—L. 17. Read *قَاصًّا*.—12, 17. Read *الجارج* (cf. l. 10).—10, 19, last word. Read *قَاصًّا*.—12, 17. Read *لمقتضاه*.—L. 18. Read *وسرف في العطاء*.—13, 5. The name of this man is *محمد بن الربيع* (not *ربيعه*), see the note above, p. 185. The same mistake p. 124, l. 3. Correct the Index accordingly, and add to the references there 152, 9 and 153, 13.—L. 18. Add *حدثنا* at the end of the line.—14, 19. For *مسلمه* read *مسئله*.—15, 3. Insert another *قال* after *فائه* *وإن اخذهم يبيع رزقه*.—L. 4. *وردان* is plainly wrong. I

mind the other codex, not used by Gottheil. It may be worth while to add, that in the Paris MS 1686, written in 585 A. H., the chapter on the qādis is comprised in foll. 140b-51b (Gottheil: "140b-141b"), which would make about twenty-six pages (Gottheil: "thirteen pages") of the London MS of al-K'indi.

should conjecture: **فَاتَهُ كَانَ اخْذَهُمْ بَيْعٍ رَزَقَهُ**; cf. the account which follows.—18, 6. There are two similar names, **شَرَاهِيل** (the correct one here) and **شُرْحَبِيل**, but no such name as the one given by this MS.—L. 10. Insert **حَدَّثَنِي** after the first **قَالَ**.—L. 19. The name is **أَبْدَا**, not **أَنْدَا**; see Wüstenfeld's *Tabellen*.—19, 6. Something is missing from the text here. Either this MS or one of its ancestors accidentally dropped a line or two just after the word **سَعِيد**. 'Ubaid Allāh ibn Sa'id was not a **سَعْدِي** (the Index must be corrected accordingly), and since he flourished in the third century he cannot have taken part in this incident of the year 83. Who the al-Ḥārith as-Sa'dī al-Ḥaulānī was, I do not know. Probably **مَرَّةً أُخْرَى** should also be inserted in l. 8 after **الْحَارِث**, as in Ibn Ḥajar (text given in Gottheil's note).—24, 4. For **عَبْد** **عَبِيدُ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْحَبَابِ** read **عَبِيدُ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْحَبَابِ**, and cf. Ibn Duqmāq, IV, 39, 131; Ibn Ḥaldūn, IV, 188 (**أَبُو الْقَاسِمِ**). Correct the Index accordingly.—25, 8. Cancel **الْلَيْث**! It came in from the preceding line.—Ll. 15 ff. The wind cast a scrap of paper (**سَحَاءَةٌ**) upon his lap (**جَرَّةً**), not an iron shovel (**مَسْحَاةً**) upon a rock (**جَرَّةً**).—27, 4. The name in the second half of the line is of course not the subject of the verb **قَالَ**, but the *superscription of the section* which begins here. It should either be overlined, or else omitted altogether, with a note.—28, 4. For **وَسَبْعِينَ** read **وَتَسْعِينَ**.—L. 19. For the first **عَنْ** read **بْنِ**.—32, 16. The name is **خُذَامِر**, as in the better MSS of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam.—34, 11. For **جَوْرَقِينَ**, which makes no sense, read **خَرَزَقِينَ**.—L. 13. For **أَبْنِ رَزِين** read **أَبْنِ رَزِير**.—35, 14. Apparently, the most important word in the clause has been accidentally omitted. Was it **مُظْلُومًا**, following **كَانَ**?—36, 13, 15. In both places read **الْحَبَابِ**, and correct the Index accordingly.—L. 15. There is a bad gap in the MS here, which the editor has not noticed. The qāḍī Yaḥyā was not directly followed by Tauba. Two others intervened, namely, Yazīd ibn Abdallāh ibn Ḥudāmir and al-Ḥiyār ibn Ḥalīd. These are duly named in the *Futūḥ Miṣr* and the *Ḥusn*, and what is more, they were obviously included here by al-Kindī, since we are told at the top of the next page that Tauba received his appointment *upon the death of al-Ḥiyār*. A considerable passage has therefore been lost here by accident. It may be possible to bridge the gap in part by the help of Ibn Ḥajar and Ibn Šāhīn—neither of which I have seen.—37, 1. For **الْجَبَّار** read **الْخَبَّار**.—

L. 10. For **فَأَمَّا إِنْ** read **فَأَمَّا أَنْ**, and delete the period just preceding. Amedroz has pointed out the true reading of the remainder of the line.—

L. 15. **فَأَبَتِ الطَّلَاقَ فَصَاحَتْ** will not do in this context. The first two of these words must have been **فَأَنْتِ طَالِقٌ** in the original, and the two immediately following were parenthetical, thus: Her husband said to her, "You are divorced" (she cried out, but he continued) "if you ever say a word to me about any litigant," etc.—38, 5. The reading of the next to the last word in the line must be **إِنْ**, not **أَنْ**.—L. 16. For

الْمَرْأَةِ read **امْرَأَةٍ**.—L. 17. The correct reading (see Gottheil's note) is

لَرَسَا لِلَّهِ.—43, 9. The name is **بِشْرٍ**, not **نَشْرٍ**; cf. 44, 14; 50, 18; etc.

Correct the Index.—44, 10. After **أَحْمَدُ بْنُ** several words have been accidentally omitted; cf. l. 14.—46, 12. Insert **كَانَ** after **قَالَ**.—51, 11.

The first word in the line should be divided into two words, **وَا ذَلَالَةٌ**.—

55, 3. Read **فَكَانَ**. For **أَوْحَنَ** read **إِذَا نَحْنُ**, as in Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and Ibn Ḥajar.—L. 15. Cancel **ابْنِ** at the end of the line.—

56, 1. There is a considerable gap here, not noticed by the editor, after the word **بَكَرٍ**. In the passage which has fallen out, the story of the murder of Ibn 'Utba was told. The text as it now stands makes no

sense.—L. 9. For **ابْنِ** read **مَنْ**.—59, 3. For **فَإِنَّ** read **بِأَنَّ**.—L. 14.

For **إِلَى أَبِي** read **إِلَى أَبِي**—60, 11. The name is **سَعْدٌ**, not **سَعِيدٌ**.

According to the Index, p. 170, the matter is in doubt; but a statement in the text, 17, 2 f., makes it absolutely certain.—61, 9. Read **فَقَامَ**.—

L. 11. The note, p. xxviii, proposes to emend here, but the text is correct as it stands.—L. 19. For **أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ** substitute **أَبِي الْمَهْدِيِّ**. This *lapsus*

was probably made by al-Kindī himself.—62, 19. After **وَعُوثٌ** must be inserted **قَاضٍ**, as in Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam (see the note). The two words

are parenthetical.—65, 19. For **إِلَى أَحْمَدَ** read **إِلَى لَأَحْمَدَ**.—67, 1. For

أَخَذَ read **أَهْذَا**. (I had made this correction before seeing that Ibn

Ḥajar actually has the reading.)—69, 3. The reading of the MS, **وَأَنْبَنِي**

(the usual license), is required.—L. 10. The readings given by Ibn Ḥajar, **لَهَا** and **عِنْدَنَا**, are the correct ones, as shown by the context.—71, 1.

For the bare name **رَبِيعَةَ**, as the partial name of a man otherwise

unidentified, two references, 71, 1 and 59, 1, are given in the Index. In the present passage the man is evidently Rabi'a ibn Farrūḥ († c. 140); in 59, 1 the name is not ربيعة, but ربيع, namely Rabi' ibn Yūnus, the chamberlain of al-Manṣūr, as the context makes quite certain.—L. 9. For the second **عن** read **أَنَّ**.—77, 9. Abu 'l-Baḥtārī.—79, 9. For **بين** **بين عمرو بن يزيد** read **عمر** **وبين يزيد**.—L. 11. Read **منزلة**.—80, 8. Read **يصير**.—L. 9. In the Index, p. 175, the name al-Ja'di is put by itself. But this was merely a *nisba* of Aṣḥab, who is named in this same line.—L. 12. Read **آية** and **يرهب**.—81, 16. The last four words in the line must be canceled. Someone was misled by the adjective **الشرقية** into thinking of the district **الشرقية** in Upper Egypt. Hence the conflate text (into which a second **الحوف** then came by accident). These people came only from the eastern al-Ḥauf and from the Syrian desert; see 72, 7.—82, 4. Read **الزور**.—L. 10. Read **جيلة** “his tribe,” or **حبله** “his tie of kinship”? The reading of the text is impossible.—L. 11. Read **سفاها** and **وأجلبوا**.—L. 12. The meter requires **رغما**.—83, 4. Both meter and sense demand **دُكِرْتُ**.—84, 1. Instead of **البلا** **بَيْنَ** read **الثلاثين**, i. e., “the whole month”; cf. the following line.—L. 4. Read **ولتكشفن**.—L. 9. Transfer the **ن** to the *second* half-verse.—85, 11. For **نُصِبَ** read **يُصَبُّ**.—L. 12. Read **الكذب**.—L. 17. Read **اوبقى** (as plur. of **صائب**).—L. 18. Point **كريم**.—88, 6. Write **اوبقى** as one word.—92, 15. For **نُحِّيَ عن** read **نُحِّيَ** (see the note).—93, 17. Read **ناحية**.—96, 14. The meter requires the pointing **مُلَصَّقٍ**.—98, 18. For **أَنَّ يُحْيِي** read **يُحْيِي**. This is a verb, not a proper name. Correct the Index accordingly.—101, 10. Another gap in the text. It is plain that something, probably one line of a MS, has fallen out after the word **عن**.—L. 11. Point **إنه**.—102, 15. Point **أجاز**.—L. 18. The meter requires **رأس** (the verb, without *hamza*).—103, 13. Instead of **جباه**, which fits neither meter nor sense, read **بجباه**: “They appear with foreheads black from butting against the prayer-mats.” The

immediate context makes the emendation certain.—104, 13. The name is *الْجَم* بن نصر; cf. 78, 5, etc.—105, 15. The meter requires *الْجَم*.—108, 9. Should not the last name in the line be *مرزوق*? Cf. 127, 11; 131, 13; 139, 13.—109, 7. For *آمنه وآمن وأمر* read *آمن*.—L. 19. For *قال* read *لَأَسْكِنَ*.—110, 1. Read *إِنَّ*.—L. 16. After the first insert *حدثنا*.—113, 3. Read *والقاسم*.—114, 3. The text reading, *أَذَلَّكَ*, is the correct one; a mere neophyte.—115, 10. Read *يُخَافُ؟*—119, 3. Read *لِلْعَيْرِ*.—L. 9. Why change *فَدَفَعُ* and *فَفَرَشَتْ*.—L. 4. Read *مَنْ* in place of *مَمَّن*.—L. 9. Several words, at least, are missing after *إخواني*.—L. 19. The reading of the MS, *له* (not *لك*), is correct. The editor has failed to notice that there is a considerable gap in the text after this word.—121, 15. For *إِذَا* read *أَمَّا*.—122, 9. *أَنَّ* must *not* be changed to *إِنَّ* (see note).—124, 3. Read *تُجَاهَةً*; see above, p. 185, note.—L. 12. Read *تُجَاهَةً*, “openly,” “face to face.”—L. 13. Read *ظَاعِنٌ*, as in MS and Ibn Hajar.—126, 16. The name is *أحمد بن محمد*.—127, 17 f. There is a considerable gap here, and the fact ought to be noticed that it comes just after the word *أخبرنا* at the end of l. 17.—128, 1. *حلقة ابن صبيح* ought not to be in the Index of Places, etc. (p. 211)!—L. 4. For *يَوْمَ* read *بَرَمَ*. The text of this poem is not in very good shape.—L. 7. For *فريقهم* read *فريقهم*.—L. 11. For *ابن بن* read *أَبْنُ أَبْنُ*.—L. 12. For *لَبِثْتُ* read *لَبِثْتُ*, as meter and sense require.—133, 14. Insert *عند* after *وشهد*.—L. 16. The editor says: “Before *ويقول* something evidently is omitted!” I cannot see, however, that anything is omitted; the text seems to me to be just right as it stands.—134, 4. The text of this half-verse is in terrible condition. For *إبراهيم* (!) read *أَمْ هُمْ*; “They will find out who is to be deposed, *whether thou or they!*” For *فانتهم الأكل* read *بِأَظْلَاهَا* and *الآمال*.—135, 5. *أيام* is impossible. The original must have been either *أمثال* (as in Ibn Hajar),

"the *show-figures* with the tall hats and all those who approved them," or else أَتَّام (feeling certainly ran high enough to justify the use of such a word).—L. 7. Read الْجَمَال.—L. 8. Read يَتَفَرَّغُونَ and تَقْطَعُ.—L. 10. Read لَمْ يَدْخَرْ.—L. 12. Read مُقْفِر.—137, 1. Judging from what Gottheil says of the remaining traces in the MS, the missing words at the end of the line are إِنَّمَا هُوَ, which makes good sense.—L. 2. Insert بيت before الْمَال.—Ll. 9, 11. The verb is اسْتَقْصَى.—138, 11. For فيها read فِيهَا.—L. 12. Cancel the words ! يَزِيدُ التَّرَكِّي The clause is conflate, and the other name is the right one.—L. 13. For صَوْت read صَوْتُ.—140, 5. Only *the name* is missing; and that is given (in corrupt form?) in 141, 5.—L. 8. Read حَوْطُ.—142, 11. The reading of the MS (to be pointed وَضَرَبَ) is the correct one, and there should be no question of changing it.—Read مَقْعَدًا.—144, 7. Read سَقَطَ, with Ibn Hajar. This is the oft-quoted phrase from the Koran, VII, 148.—145, 19. At the point where the period stands, in this line, something has been lost from the text. *The words* وَذَكَرَ الْفَضْلُ بْنُ مَرْوَانَ *are a part of the quoted words of the letter*, and not by any means those with which the quotation originally began. That the gap is very old, and the resulting mutilated text very misleading, may be seen from Ibn Hajar (quoted in Gottheil's note), whose text speaks of "the letter of al-Faḍl ibn Marwān to the *amīr* of Egypt." But al-Faḍl (the *wazīr* of al-Mu'taṣim) did not write the letter! There can be no doubt whatever on this point, in view of 146, 3, with the context immediately preceding, and the explicit statement in 146, 14 that Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥaṣīb was the one who wrote it. The omitted passage can hardly have been less than two lines in extent, and may have been more.—146, 1. The *hamza* should of course be deleted in بِالْإِنْحِرَافِ. The volume contains a good many other instances of this same wrong use, for which the blame is probably to be put upon the printer and the proofreaders.—L. 2. Read وَإِنَّ.—L. 5. Read بِدَارِ عَلِيٍّ is correct.—L. 13. The unpointed word which Gottheil punctuates وَأَتَيْتَهُ is the imperative وَأَتْنَهُ. The suffix in إِلَيْهِ and عِنْدَهُ refers to the مَا أَمَرَ بِهِ of the preceding line.—L. 19. Read لِلْسَّهْلِ.—147, 19. The original text of the beginning of the letter, in this recension, was probably: أَيُّهَا الْقَاضِي بَلِّغْ أَمِيرَ




المؤمنين أَنَّ كتابك وصل الخ. Ibn Ḥajar gives a somewhat free reproduction here.—148, 1, 2. These two lines are in bad shape. Is it not possible to read the words which are indistinct in the MS? As for what is printed here: In the first line, فيما should be مِمَّا, and بَأْمَر is probably wrong. In the second line, it would seem better to read بِأَمْر, and فيما, استيفاقًا.—151, 2. This kunya is made into an *ism* in the Index, and the man who bore it is also confused there with the Abu 'Ubad who is mentioned in 152, 9 ff., 15 ff. The latter does not appear in the Index at all.—153, 15. Al-Warrāda is the name of a place on the road from Syria to Egypt. Add it to the Index, accordingly.—154, 6. The text should not be altered (see note); it is right as it stands.—L. 8. Read على in place of the first بن.—L. 17. It is not easy to see why this name, al-Mādarā'i, should have made so much trouble. Gottheil himself printed it correctly in the *Journal of the Am. Or. Society*, XXVII (1906), p. 238!—155, 1. In the Index, this Ibn Qutaiba is wrongly identified with the one named on pp. 148 f.—157, 6 ff. As the poem is printed here, only the third line is comprehensible; the second and fourth lines are absolutely meaningless, besides being metrically impossible.—L. 6. For التائه read النابه. This poem is laudatory throughout, not sarcastic.—L. 7. Instead of المسقع النبیه read المُسْتَقِيم والمُسْقَع النبیه; “One who pursued a straight course, save for the cliffs and the sand-wastes which were in it”; that is, as straight and even as any path can be which must encounter impassable deserts and mountains.—L. 9. In the first half-verse read قَدَحًا instead of فرجا. In the second half-verse there is one word too many. The original was probably وَرَزَّ وَرَزَّ من يليه, which fits the meter exactly. Under the influence of the parallelism of the first half-verse, the verb was introduced by some copyist. But no verb in the second person singular is metrically possible here. The whole verse: “Thou didst permit slander (of thyself) to him who wished it; but its burden was borne by him who perpetrated it.”—158, 11. For الصغير read الصيرفي.—159, 8. Read إِنَّ.—L. 14. Read يحضره.—160, 16. For محمد read عمر.—161, 7. The *nisba* added to the name Abu Tāhir in the margin of the MS (see note) is not الرملة but الذُهَلِّي; thus in Ibn Ḥallikān, as well as in the *Husn*, and elsewhere.—162, 9. For the second “Muḥammad” read “Aḥmad.”—163, 6. For ساء في الخامس read أحمد.—L. 8. The words ساء في الخامس do

not appear to belong to the text at all, but look like a marginal note on some corrupt reading (in one of the parent MSS?).—165, 4. For الدَّوَابَّة read الدُّوَابَّة. This gives the answer to Gottheil's query in this same line, where he thinks that the name of a fixed star is given. It is a comet that is described!—L. 7. For كثير احدهما read كثيرة احد مآ.—L. 10. For للطفلة read الطفلة.

C. C. TORREY

YALE UNIVERSITY

ASSYRIAN IDEOGRAMS¹

In *Babyloniaca* II, III, I have reviewed the first four parts of Meissner's *Seltene assyrische Ideogramme*. The entire work in nine parts has now been completed. The entries number 9,380, most of which are additions to the 14,487 entries of the original list of Brünnow. Meissner, following the scheme of his predecessor, adds a large number of ideograms whose first sign or signs are illegible in the known texts. This section contains 413 entries. He adds 1,728 corrections and additions which he obtained from various sources. In one respect his book presents a great improvement on Brünnow, in that he has given the Assyrian words found in his book in compact form in Latin transcription. The Sumerian values follow in transcription with no attempt to divide them into (1) sign-names, (2) phonetic values, and (3) Semitic values. As he paid little attention to sign-names in his book it is of course rare that he has catalogued any at all, except in case of simple signs whose major phonetic value is identical with the sign-name plus the Semitic desinence added by the scribes. So in entering BUR () whose sign-name is būru, both name and phonetic value appear in the list. When, however, a sign enters into a compound, its phonetic value can be often obtained by analyzing the compound. For instance, we would not know the word NUMUN for seed () Semitic zēru, but for the sign-name of  = NUMUN EŠ-GUNU-KI-KI (CT, XI, 49, 31) = Kullaba, Hallab. The word NUMUN, seed, offspring, beginning, occurs often, and occasionally spelled out NU-MU-UN; besides the citations in *Babyloniaca* III, 147, see Gudea Cyl. B, 13, 6, 9; 23, 6 f. This value does not appear either in his "Nachträge" or in his list of phonetic values.² In K 4174,

¹ Meissner, Bruno, SELTENE ASSYRISCHE IDEOGRAMME, Assyriologische Bibliothek, Vol. XX, in nine parts, xx+721 pp. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

² See also *Babyloniaca* III, 148, No. 1,146¹.